

REMARKS

Claims 1-18 remain in the application and claims 1 and 11 have been amended hereby.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 1-10 under 35 USC 103(a), as being unpatentable over Nakatani in view of Ball et al., Suzuki, and Yoshioka.

A feature of the dubbing system according to the present invention is a control unit for generating data for imposing payment based on a user ID, a dubbing speed selected by a user, and a copyright holder ID read from the first recording medium. See page 11, lines 12-14 of the present application, for example.

Other features of the present invention are a payment imposing unit for determining based on the user ID, the dubbing speed selected by the user, and the copyright holder ID read from the first recording medium, a payment amount, and for transmitting to the control unit data indicative of proper completion of imposing payment when an electronic transfer of funds equal to the payment amount is withdrawn from the user's account and transferred to an account specified by the copyright holder. See the paragraph bridging pages 11 and 12 of the present application for example.

It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Nakatani, Ball et al., Suzuki, and Yoshioka fails to show or suggest at least imposing a payment based on a copyright holder ID read from the first recording medium and a dubbing speed

selected by the user.

The Office Action concedes that the combination of Nakatani and Ball et al. fails to show or suggest imposing a payment based on a dubbing speed selected by a user. Further, it is submitted that the combination of Nakatani and Ball et al. fails to show or suggest imposing a payment based on a copyright holder ID read from the first recording medium. The Office Action cites Suzuki as curing these deficiencies.

It is respectfully submitted that Suzuki is merely disclosing transmitting via a transmission line programs compressed using different methods and at different compression rates. See col. 10, lines 6-23 of Suzuki, for example.

The apparatus of Suzuki is silent about imposing a payment based on a dubbing speed selected by a user and silent about imposing a payment based on a copyright holder ID read from the first recording medium and, because there are no features in Yoshioka that somehow could be combined with Nakatani, Ball et al., and Suzuki and result in the presently claimed invention, it is respectfully submitted that amended independent claim 1, and the claims depending therefrom, are patentably distinct over Nakatani in view of Ball et al., Suzuki, and Yoshioka.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of claims 11-18 under 35 USC 103(a), as being unpatentable over Ball et al. in view of Suzuki and Yoshioka.

The Office Action concedes that Ball et al. fails to show or

suggest imposing a payment based on a dubbing speed selected by a user. Further, it is submitted that Ball et al. fails to show or suggest imposing a payment based on a copyright holder ID read from the first recording medium. The Office Action cites Suzuki as curing these deficiencies.

It is respectfully submitted that Suzuki is merely disclosing transmitting via a transmission line programs compressed using different methods and at different compression rates. See col. 10, lines 6-23 of Suzuki, for example.


The apparatus of Suzuki is silent about imposing a payment based on a dubbing speed selected by a user and silent about imposing a payment based on a copyright holder ID read from the first recording medium and, because there are no features in Yoshioka that somehow could be combined with Ball et al. and Suzuki and result in the presently claimed invention, it is respectfully submitted that amended independent claim 11, and the claims depending therefrom, are patentably distinct over Ball et al. in view of Suzuki and Yoshioka.

Entry of this amendment is earnestly solicited, and it is respectfully submitted that the amendments made to the claims hereby raise no new issues requiring further consideration and/or search, because all of the features of this invention have clearly been considered by the examiner in the prosecution of this application and because the present amendments serve only to further define and emphasize the novel features of this

invention.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,  
COOPER & DUNHAM LLP

  
Jay H. Maioli  
Reg. No. 27,213

JHM/PCF:tb  
encl.